UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,921	12/31/2003	Brian Wester	25332	1401
	7590 02/15/200 SER COMPANY	EXAMINER		
	AL PROPERTY DEPT	HALPERN, MARK		
P.O. BOX 9777 FEDERAL WAY, WA 98063			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1731	
•	0)			
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 02/15/2007		02/15/2007	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/15/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@weyerhaeuser.com

	;	
,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Off: - A - 4' - O	10/749,921	WESTER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examinér	Art Unit
	Mark Halpern	1731
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a repl rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cause the application to become ABAN	ATION. y be timely filed  S from the mailing date of this communication.  IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 De	ecember 2006	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	<b>\$</b>	s, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	* 1	-
	,	
Disposition of Claims	•	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8-10 and 12-16</u> is/are pending in t	he application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	vn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	; ;	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8-10 and 12-16</u> is/are rejected.	:	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	٠.	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	
Annilla Man Banana	<u>.</u>	
Application Papers	;	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	<u> </u>	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached (	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	*! 	
Δ1	* *	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents		Page Care Na
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	F	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	· ·	ceived in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau	7	and the state of
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not re	ceived.
i	i	
*.	•	
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sur	nmary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/I	Mail Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Info	rmal Patent Application

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1) Acknowledgement is made of Amendment received 12/4/2006.

Claims 4-5, 10 are amended, and new claims 12-16 are offered for consideration.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3) Claims 1, 5, 8-10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott, (Sludge Characteristics and Disposal Alternatives for the Pulp and Paper Industry, 1995 International Environmental Conference, Atlanta, GA., 7-10, May 1995, TAPPI Press, pgs. 269-279, 1995) in view of Lee (1,155,741).

Claims 1, 9-10: Scott discloses a process in a paper mill where virgin fiber raw material is processed and resulting waste material generated from the virgin fiber in the form of sludge is sent for treatment (pg. 269, Figure 1). The sludge includes waste fiber from the virgin fiber raw material; the amount of sludge generated in the paper mill is shown in Table I (pg. 270). The treatment includes dewatering of the waste fiber and clarifier separation (pg. 270, Figure 2)( pgs. 269-271, Figures 1, 2). The sludge is dried and then utilized as bedding material for animals, such as, cattle (pg. 277, col. 2, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph). Energy recovery and utilization is well known in the pulping art, as for

Application/Control Number: 10/749,921

Art Unit: 1731

example, disclosed by Lee, where in a papermaking process waste fiber bagasse, separated from virgin bagasse, is undergoing drying with waste heat of flue gases (entire document). It would have been obvious, to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Scott and Lee, because such a combination would provide for a cost efficient drying of waste fibers in the process of Scott. In view that the present specification does not define the fiber agglomeration nor it retaining of bulk structure and appearance, fiber product of Scott retain the fiber

Page 3

Claims 5, 8: dewatering by means of primary and secondary clarifier performs the same or similar function and obtains the same or similar results as does the claimed apparatus.

agglomeration, retain the bulk structure and appearance.

4) Claims 2-4, 12-16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott in view of Lee, and further in view of Sugarman (2,708,418).

Claims 2-4, 12-14: Scott in view of Lee is applied as above for claims 1, 10, Scott in view of Lee fails to disclose a treatment substance added to the fiber. Sugarman discloses adding sodium silicate to the fibers (col. 1,line 59 to col. 2, line 40). It would have been obvious, to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Scott and Lee with Sugarman, because such a combination would provide the product of Scott with a chemical additive that functions as a binder, adhesive and wetting agent, important functions in animal bedding, as disclosed by Sugarman.

Art Unit: 1731

Claims 15-16: dewatering by means of primary and secondary clarifier performs the same or similar function and obtains the same or similar results as does the claimed apparatus.

# Response to Amendment

- 5) Claim 4 objection is withdrawn.
- 6) Claims 1, 5, 8-10 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott, (Sludge Characteristics and Disposal Alternatives for the Pulp and Paper Industry, 1995 International Environmental Conference, Atlanta, GA., 7-10, May 1995, TAPPI Press, pgs. 269-279, 1995) in view of Mansour (5,637,192), is withdrawn.
- 7) Claims 2-4 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott in view of Mansour, and further in view of Sugarman (2,708,418), is withdrawn.
- 8) Applicant's arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

9) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone number is 571-272-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/749,921

Art Unit: 1731

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark Halpern V Primary Examiner Art Unit 1731